

## BOARD OF BARBERING AND COSMETOLOGY

### FINAL STATEMENT OF REASONS

**Hearing Date:** August 1, 2013

**Subject Matter of Proposed Regulations:** Equipment for Schools

**Sections Affected:** Section 940, California Code of Regulations

#### **Updated Information**

- During the course of this rulemaking, the Board discovered two errors in the fiscal impact estimates for cosmetology schools described in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, Initial Statement of Reasons and the Economic and Fiscal Impact Statement (STD 399). The number of mannequin heads under the proposed regulations would be ten (10) rather than two (2), while the number of shampoo bowls would be five (5) rather than four (4). This means the estimated initial equipment cost for a cosmetology school would be approximately \$7,500 rather than \$7,000.
- During the course of this rulemaking, the Board identified a typographical error in the Initial Statement of Reasons in the Factual Basis/Rationale for the barber school requirements. The number of barber schools in California is “one-tenth” of the number of cosmetology schools.
- During the course of this rulemaking, the Board identified and corrected a minor typographical error (an extraneous “a”) in the section labeled “Effect on Small Business”. The sentence should read as follows: “Moreover, all of the equipment required under these regulations is necessary for the successful operation of barbering, cosmetology and electrology schools.”
- During the course of this rulemaking, the Board was asked by the Department of Consumer Affairs’ Division of Legislative & Policy Review to explain why this regulatory proposal would have no effect on the state’s environment, as stated in the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking’s section labeled “Benefits of Regulation” under “Results of Economic Impact Assessment/Analysis.” The reason is that the equipment requirements do not include such things as toxic chemicals and other products and tools that could conceivably cause environmental damage.

#### **Local Mandate**

A mandate is not imposed on local agencies or school districts.

#### **Small Business Impact**

There is no significant impact to small business.

### **Consideration of Alternatives**

No reasonable alternative which was considered or that has otherwise been identified and brought to the attention of the board would be more effective in carrying out the purpose for which the regulation is proposed, would be as effective and less burdensome to affected private persons than the adopted regulation, or would be more cost effective to affected private persons and equally effective in implementing the statutory policy on other provision of law.

### **Summary of, and Responses to, Comments Received During the 45-day Comment Period**

No comments were received.